

Sinclair  
Broadcasting's  
decision to force  
their stations to  
air an anti-Kerry  
documentary days  
before the election  
is another of many  
clear examples of  
the dangers of media  
consolidation.

We've seen the  
danagerous effects of  
media consolidation  
over the past few  
decades, as  
programming has been  
increasingly forced  
to correspond to the  
interests of  
corporate owners,  
rather than  
journalistic  
standards of  
critical inquiry and  
the "public's right  
to know." Sinclair  
uses the public  
airwaves free of  
charge, and is  
obligated by law to  
serve the public  
interest.  
Broadcasting  
pro-Bush  
(anti-Kerry)  
propaganda does not  
serve the public  
interest. Were  
Sinclair to order  
more in-depth  
examination of the  
records of \*both\*  
the candidates, this  
would indicate  
service to the  
public. But when  
large companies  
control the  
airwaves, we get  
more of what's good  
for the bottom line  
and less of what we  
need for our  
democracy. Instead  
of something

produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Nothing less than the future of our Democracy depends on this. We are becoming a country where free speech and diverse viewpoints are disappearing from the public airwaves. Instead we are being ruled by the tyranny of the bottom line, which bears more and more resemblance to the tyrannical dictates of other despotic governments we claim to be steering toward Democracy.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.